

those amendments which are least objectionable. We have wrestled with this question since the first day of the session, and we have met with every opposition that could be raised.

"Will the next session of the General Assembly be competent to amend this act after the people have voted?" asked Dr. Winston, of Prince Edward.

I had expected to sit quiet and take no part in this debate; but it is my duty to say to this House that you are not competent to amend the monopoly of the wine and beer business, or the corporations for all time. Dr. Winston asked some time ago if the next General Assembly could propose any obnoxious amendments to this bill, and

another referendum on this bill without having read much on the subject of initiative and referendum, and am the patron of a bill pending here for that purpose, and the authorities agree that where such law is passed, there would be a constitutional provision for referendum, there would be grave doubt whether such a law could be repealed or amended, except by the same process as was for its enactment. It was enacted. How would you draw a law amending this act? Those States that use the initiative and referendum have no constitutional provisions for repealing or amending laws passed by the people.

Unconstitutional on Its Face.
 "I have asked a number of lawyers as to the constitutionality of this measure, and in view of the monopoly granted to certain manufacturers, they have said that on its face it is unconstitutional. Do you believe this Legislature could pass a law to make more grocery or clothing stores could be opened in the State, but that those now in business could continue—do you believe any such law would hold?"
 "Considering that the State has the right under the

Weaver, "perhaps to limit the number, and certainly to prohibit altogether the manufacture of liquor in the State, do you believe it in the province of the General Assembly to destroy a part and discriminate in favor of another part—to say to the distiller you must abandon your plant and go out of business, and at the same time say to the brewer you may continue, and if you will ship your product, you may export it?"

"Doesn't the right to prohibit, specified in the Constitution, carry with it the right to partially prohibit?" asked Mr. Gordon.

"You can regulate or prohibit the manufacture or sale of liquor under the fourth section of the Constitution," answered Mr. White, "but, under the fourth section of the Constitution,"

which says that no man or set of men is entitled to exclusive or special emoluments or privileges from the community—you cannot give any class of manufacturers a monopoly. Section 63, clause 12, of the Constitution, expressly says that the General Assembly shall not enact any local, special or private law regulating labor, trade, mining or manufacturing. Breweries and wine distilleries are manufacturing plants. You can't give this privilege to some and take it away from others.

"Why allow the brewers who have a wine cellar in Norfolk to continue in business after this act takes effect, and yet prohibit me from starting a wine cellar in Rockbridge? Why give the brewers now in operation a monopoly and prohibit the establishment of competing plants? I appeal to this House to reconsider this bill and send it back to conference, that these provisions, which will absolutely destroy its value, may be stricken out.

Why to they want these things in there to catch votes. They want the votes of the farmers and the wine manufacturers and the cider manufacturers. All these men will advocate the so-called prohibition bill, which gives them a monopoly in the manufacture of such goods in this State. It is a dodge to catch votes in this State-wide election—only this and nothing more."

"Don't you know that this bill is not what we want?" asked Mr. Meetez.

"that it is merely the best we can get" "I know that the dry men in the Senate put it in that way," Mr. White answered Mr. White. "It was a dry man who offered the wine exemption of his own motion. It was a dry man who offered the cider amendment. I say it is a cowardly makeshift to catch votes, and nothing more. If the dry people had put on the wine amendment and the cider amendment, the wet people handed up their cup for beer and got it. I am not willing to make any compromise of principle. Don't tell me

people put the amendments on. The bill is unconstitutional, as we have no plan of initiative or referendum in this State, and it is unconstitutional because it creates an absolute monopoly of certain lines of business.

How Can It Be Amended?

"Do you claim," asked Mr. Jordan, "that if this bill is enacted and prohibition is enacted into law by the will of the people, that that takes away from this House the right to pass future acts amending it?"

"All authorities on the subject of the

Initiative and referendum," answered Mr. White, "Are there that the power which enacted must repeal. The issue is one that has never been before the courts of this State. It would be a travesty on the Initiative and referendum to allow the next General Assembly to come in and in a few minutes, upset what it has taken the people of the State a year to enact. I stand for an amendment to our Constitution providing how there shall be such a referendum, and how it may be repealed."

"I voted for this bill," said Major Stubbs, of Gloucester, "because I thought it was right, because I thought it was constitutional and because I thought my people wanted the enabling act passed. I voted against some of these amendments, and put myself on record. I stand for the bill as it left this House—the bill that gives prohibition—the bill I promised my people to vote for. I do not think the amend-

ments ratified to-day are in keeping with the views of my people on this question. This General Assembly can not enact a private or local law as to one class of manufacturing that does not apply to all persons alike."

Senate Action Announced.

"Allow me to announce," said Judge Williams, that the Senate has adopted the conference report." The announcement caused a ripple of applause in the galleries and had a marked effect on the attitude of the House.

"Then the wets have succeeded in what they wanted, and the dreds have

Stiff Neck

or any other stiffness or lameness of strained and aching muscles, should have prompt relief. Nothing like

SLOAN'S

LINIMENT

to remove the soreness! Try it for backache—in fact, most any kind of pain.

Mr. A. Moore, Manchester, N. H., writes: "I suffered with an awful stiffness in my legs. I tried two or three liniments—no use. Finally I tried Sloan's, and after two mornings could

At all dealers. Price 25c., 50c. & \$1.00
Dr. Earl S. Sloan, Inc., Boston, Mass.

OF THE